



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/539,745

02/28/2006

Janos Veres

MERCK-3045

8598

24997 7590 07/16/2008  
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, PC  
2200 CLARENDON BLVD  
SUITE 1400  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

MAKSYMONKO, JOHN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/16/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/539,745	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VERES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> John M. Maksymonko	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20050620</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 12, 23-24, 26, 28-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9-10, 13, 17-20, 22, and 24-26 of copending Application No. 11/572,872. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons. The '872 claims recite an organic semiconducting composition comprising a polymer with a molecular weight of at least 5,000 and an oligomer with a molecular weight of from 150 to 1,000 containing an arylamine group, having a charge carrier mobility of at least  $10^{-4} \text{cm}^2/\text{V.s}$ , in a ratio of 30:70 to 70:30, for use in an electronic or electrophotographic device including an FET, OLED, photodetector, chemical detector, photovoltaic cell, capacitor, or memory.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 23 and 30 provide for the use of a composition, but, since the claims do not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-3, 11, 14-17, 22, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Doi et al. (US 2002/0058157).

Regarding claims 1-3, Doi discloses a composition comprising a higher molecular weight semiconducting compound ([0076]) wherein the Mn is at least 7,000 ([0164]), comprises a conjugated polymer containing fluorene units ([0162]) and a lower molecular weight organic semiconducting compound having a Mn of between 150 and 1000 and is a non oligomeric molecule (Alkylbenzene sulfonate ion: [0107]), further comprising a binder resin ([0139]) and in the form of a layer ([0104]) used in an organic light emitting diode (Abstract)

***. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

9. Claims 1-12, 14-20, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Woo et al. (WO 99/54385).

Regarding claims 1-3, 11-12, 14-20, and 24-28, Woo discloses a composition comprising a high molecular weight conjugated copolymer of fluorene units and arylamine units (Page 4, Lines 10-15) having a molecular weight of 10,000 or greater (Page 4, Line 3) and an oligomer possibly having 4 repeating units (Page 5, Line 6) of

fluorene (Page 2, Line 8) and thereby a molecular weight of between 150 and 1,000. Also, the reference discloses the composition in the form of a layer and used in a light emitting diode (Films: Page 11, Line 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have selected the overlapping portion of the ranges disclosed by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549.

Regarding limitations recited in claims 4-7 which are directed to specific properties of a material recited in said claim, the Office realizes that all of the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference(s). However, the reference(s) teaches all of the claimed ingredients. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. a charge carrier mobility value would implicitly be achieved by a composition with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Regarding the amounts of the low and high molecular weight compounds recited in claims 8-10, when faced with a mixture, one of ordinary skill in the art would have immediately envisaged a 1:1 ratio, a ratio that falls within the presently claimed amount, absent evidence of unexpected or surprising results. Case law holds that "[h]aving established that this knowledge was in the art, the examiner could then properly rely... on a conclusion of obviousness, 'from common knowledge and common sense of the

Art Unit: 1796

person of ordinary skill in the art within any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference." In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969).

Regarding the method limitations recited in claims 25-27 the examiner notes that even though a product-by-process is defined by the process steps by which the product is made, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). As the court stated in Thorpe, 777 F.2d at 697, 227 USPQ at 966 (The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. In re Pilkington, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969). If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 1-22 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (WO 02/45184) in view of Levesque et al. (Organic tunable electroluminescent diodes from polyfluorene derivatives)..

Regarding claims 1-22 and 24-29, Brown discloses a composition comprising an organic semiconducting compound having a number average molecular weight of at least 7000 (Page 22, Line 11) comprising a conjugated polymer containing fluorene and arylamine units according to formula 11 wherein n is at least 20 (Page 21, Lines 10-15), and further comprising a binder resin (Abstract) and the composition as a layer (Abstract) used in a field effect transistor (Abstract). The reference does not explicitly disclose the addition of a low molecular weight molecule to the composition.

Levesque teaches a composition for electroluminescent diodes comprising a polyfluorene (Abstract) and a non-oligomeric arylamine molecule conforming to formula 1 and having a molecular weight of between 150 and 1,000 (TPD: Page 79, Column 2,



Section 2. Polymeric Device) in order to improve the luminescence of the polymer (Page 80, Column 2, Section 4. Luminance).

As both Brown and Levesque relate to organic semiconductor materials, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the arylamine molecule of Levesque to the polymeric composition of Brown for the purpose of improving the luminescence of the polymer (Levesque: Page 80, Column 2, Section 4. Luminance).

Regarding limitations recited in claims 4-7 which are directed to specific properties of a material recited in said claim, the Office realizes that all of the claimed effects or physical properties are not positively stated by the reference(s). However, the reference(s) teaches all of the claimed ingredients. Therefore, the claimed effects and physical properties, i.e. a charge carrier mobility value would implicitly be achieved by a composition with all the claimed ingredients. If it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case: (1) evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position; and (2) it would be the Office's position that the application contains inadequate disclosure that there is no teaching as to how to obtain the claimed properties with only the claimed ingredients.

Regarding the amounts of the low and high molecular weight compounds recited in claims 8-10, when faced with a mixture, one of ordinary skill in the art would have immediately envisaged a 1:1 ratio, a ratio that falls within the presently claimed amount, absent evidence of unexpected or surprising results. Case law holds that "[h]aving established that this knowledge was in the art, the examiner could then properly rely...

Art Unit: 1796

on a conclusion of obviousness, "from common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art within any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference." In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969).

Regarding the method limitations recited in claims 25-27 the examiner notes that even though a product-by-process is defined by the process steps by which the product is made, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). As the court stated in Thorpe, 777 F.2d at 697, 227 USPQ at 966 (The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. In re Pilkington, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969). If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.).

### ***Conclusion***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Maksymonko whose telephone number is (571)270-3239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00AM-4:30PM, and alternating Fridays 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JM

8 July 2008

/Randy Gulakowski/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796